arXiv:1409.3611v1 [hep-ph] 11 Sep 2014

New Physics effects in $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$

David Delepine,[1,*] Gaber Faisel,[2,3,†] and Carlos A. Ramirez[4,‡]

[1] *Division de Ciencias e Ingenierías, Universidad de Guanajuato, C.P. 37150, León, Guanajuato, México.*

[2] *Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Tawian 10617.*

[3] *Egyptian Center for Theoretical Physics,*

Modern University for Information and Technology, Cairo, Egypt.

[4] *Depto. de Física, Universidad de los Andes, A. A. 4976-12340, Bogotá, Colombia.*

Abstract

In this paper, we study the Cabibbo favored three body non-leptonic $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ decay. We show that the corresponding direct CP asymmetry is so tiny in the framework of the Standard Model and is out of the experimental range. Motivated by this result we extend the study of the CP asymmetry to include a toy model with CP violating weak phase equals 20° in a_2, a model with extra gauge bosons within Left-Right Grand Unification models and a model with charged Higgs boson. We show that the toy model can strongly improve the SM prediction of the CP asymmetry to be about 30%. The largest CP asymmetry can be achieved in the non-manifest Left-Right models where a CP asymmetry up to 25% can be reached. For the two Higgs doublets models the CP asymmetry is of order 10^{-3}.

* delepine@fisica.ugto.mx

† gfaisel@hep1.phys.ntu.edu.tw

‡ jpjdramirez@yahoo.com

I. INTRODUCTION

The Standard Model of the strong and electroweak interactions (SM) is one of the greatest scientific success of all the time. Until now, all experimental data are compatibles with SM predictions and the recent discovery of the Higgs particles has permitted to complete the spectrum of particles as expected within the SM with three fermion families. Also until now, the LHC has disregarded many extensions of the SM. But there are several hints that New Physics should not be far from the corner. In particular, the cosmological observation of the baryon asymmetry of the Universe is clearly a hint for New Physics as the CP asymmetry in the SM is not enough to explain it. Also Dark Matter introduced to explain the rotational curves of the galaxies doesn't find its place within SM.

Within the Standard Model, CP violation in the quark sector is only produced through the phase which appears in the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa quark mixing matrix [1, 2]. All the experimental results can be explained through the fitting of this unique phase[3]. A better accuracy in the measurement of CP asymmetries should permit to disentangle the CKM CP violating phase from New Physics CP violating sources. With LHCb and the new generation of B factories as BELLE II, the D and B physics will reach a degree of accuracy never seen until now and should be compelling in the search of New Physics with direct search for new particles done in LHC or ILC colliders.

It is why it is very interesting to look for CP asymmetries in processes forbidden or very suppressed within SM. The D physics is offering us a new window for this search. Many channels of D mesons decays have no or very suppressed CP asymmetries within SM. In particular the Cabibbo Favored (CF) D decays usually have no SM phases at tree level and can be generated only at one loop level within SM. This means that these channels can be seen as smoking gun for the search for New Physics CP violation. In previous work, we work on the CF non leptonic two body D decays into pions and Kaons and we show that within extensions with extra Higgs or with non-manifest left-right symmetry large CP asymmetries could be reached [4].

In this paper, we study the decay $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ which is CF non leptonic D decay channel [5] with a large branching ratio of 9.22(17) % [6]. But as Cabibbo Favored processes, it is expected not to have a significant CP violation within Standard Model. So, it is an interesting channel to look for new sources of CP violation.

In a first step, we quickly describe the way to parametrize the form factors (FF) of this decay mode using the FF models developed in refs. [7, 8]. It is important to notice that any other modelisation of the form factors does not change significantly the results presented in this paper. Then, we check that the SM CP asymmetries is very suppressed. In the third section, we introduce new CP violating sources. First, we propose a model-independent approach, adding a weak phase to a_2 contribution to this process and looking in which phase space range one could expect a maximal CP asymmetries. Then, we study in details two typical models of New Physics: one assuming an extra charged gauge boson and another model based on non-manifest left right symmetry. We show that in both case, a significant enhancement in the CP asymmetries is expected in some phase space ranges compared to SM.

II. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF CF NON LEPTONIC $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$

The effective Hamiltonian describing $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff.}} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{ud} \left[\sum_{i,\ a} c_{1ab}^i \bar{s}\Gamma^i c_a \bar{u}\Gamma_i d_b + \sum_{i,\ a} c_{2ab}^i \bar{u}\Gamma^i c_a \bar{s}\Gamma_i d_b \right] \tag{1}$$

here i runs over S, V and T which stand for scalar (S), vectorial (V) and tensorial (T) operators respectively. The Latin indexes $a,\ b = L,\ R$ and $q_{L,\ R} = (1 \mp \gamma_5)q$.

In the SM, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff.}}$ has only two operators [5] and the other operators can be generated only in the presence of new physics. Thus we can write

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff.}}^{SM} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{ud} \left(c_1 \bar{s}\gamma_\mu c_L \bar{u}\gamma^\mu d_L + c_2 \bar{u}\gamma_\mu c_L \bar{s}\gamma^\mu d_L \right) + \text{h.c.} \tag{2}$$

The amplitude of the decay process $D^+(p) \to K^-(p_K)\pi^+(p_1)\pi^+(p_2)$ can be obtained via

$$\mathcal{M} = < K^-\pi^+\pi^+ | \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff.}}^{SM} | D^+ > = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{ud}\, \mathcal{A} \tag{3}$$

For detailed discussion of the different contributions to the amplitude from scalar, vector and so on we refer to ref.[7]. The expression for $\mathcal{A}$ is given as [7]

$$\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{A}_s(s) + \mathcal{A}_p(s) + (s \leftrightarrow t) \tag{4}$$

where s and t are the Mandelstam variables and the expressions of $A_s(s)$ and $A_p(s)$ are given as

$$A_s(s) = \left[a_1 f_\pi \chi_S^{\text{eff.}}(m_D^2 - s) + a_2 \frac{\Delta_{D\pi}^2 \Delta_{K\pi}^2}{s} F_0^{D\pi}(s)\right] F_0^{K\pi}(s)$$
$$A_p(s) = -4\left[a_1 f_\pi \chi_V^{\text{eff.}} + a_2 F_+^{D\pi}(s)\right] F_+^{K\pi}(s) |\mathbf{p'_K}||\mathbf{p'_2}| \cos\theta' \tag{5}$$

where $a_1 \equiv c_1 + c_2/N_c = 1.2 \pm 0.1$, $a_2 \equiv c_2 - c_1/N_C = -0.5 \pm 0.1$[5] and $N_C = 3$ is the color number. $\Delta_{D\pi}^2 = m_D^2 - m_\pi^2$, $\Delta_{K\pi}^2 = m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$ and θ' is the angle between the direction of the momentum of K and the direction of the momentum π_2 in the $K - \pi_1$ center of mass frame. The Mandelstam variables are defined from the Kinematic of the process as

$$s = (p_K + p_1)^2,\ t = (p_K + p_2)^2,\ u = (p_1 + p_2)^2,\ s + t + u = m_D^2 + m_K^2 + 2m_\pi^2 \tag{6}$$

In our analysis we use [7]

$$F_{+,\,0}^{D\pi}(x) = \frac{F_+^{D\pi}(0)}{1 - x/m_{+,\,0}^2}, \qquad F_+^{D\pi}(0) = F_0^{D\pi}(0) \simeq 0.624, \tag{7}$$

where

$$m_+ = m_{D^{*0}} = 2007 \text{ MeV},\ m_0 = m_0^{*0} = 2352 \text{ MeV} \tag{8}$$

$$\chi_S^{\text{eff.}} \simeq \frac{g_{K_0^* K\pi} F_0^{DK_0^*}(m_\pi^2)}{\Gamma_{K_0^*}(m_{K_0^*}^2)|F_0^{K\pi}(m_{K_0^*}^2)|} = 4.4(28),\ 4.9(4)\ \text{GeV}^{-1},$$
$$\chi_V^{\text{eff.}} = \frac{g^* \sqrt{s}\ A_0}{m_*^2} \simeq \frac{g^* A_0}{m_*} = 4.9(2),\ 4.4(6)\ \text{GeV}^{-1} \tag{9}$$

with $F_0^{DK_0^*}(m_\pi^2) = 1.24(7)$ [9] and $F_+^{DK^*}(m_\pi^2) = 0.76(7)$ [10, 11]. For later analysis we list the expressions for the fit and interference fit partial fractions which are defined as (see Dalitz plot analysis formalism in [6])

$$f_i = \frac{\int \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}u |A_i|^2}{\int \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}u |A|^2}$$
$$f_{ij} = \frac{2\int \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}u\ \text{Re}\ (A_i A_j^*)}{\int \mathrm{d}s\mathrm{d}u |A|^2} \tag{10}$$

Model-fract.	χ_S	χ_P	ϕ_W	$f_i:\ S$	P	SPI	$2\pi^+$	I	II	III	IV
PDG[6]	-	-	-	80.2(27)	11.1(3)	-	15.4(5)	-	-	-	
Escri.-Mouss.[7, 8]	4.99	5.62	0	80.2	16.4	3.4	0	5	23.6	64.8	6.6
f_i-Cleo fit	4.99	5.52	0	82.2	14.9	2.9	0	6	22.2	62.8	9.1

TABLE I. Partial fractions in the SM using the form factor model given in refs.[7, 8]. The constants χ_S and χ_P were adjusted to fit the total BR=9.13(19) % and the s-wave contribution [6]. The additional phase given in ref.[7] between the s and p-waves was kept fixed to $\phi_{SP} = -65$. The SPI column is the s and p-waves interference. The columns labelled I-IV correspond to the contributions from the regions: I $s < 0.7$ GeV^2, II 0.7 GeV^2 $< s <$ 1 GeV^2, III 1 GeV^2 $< s <$ 2.25 GeV^2 and IV $s > 2.25$ GeV^2.

In TableI we show the results of these partial fraction in the case of the SM. The scalar and vectorial $\pi - K$ form factors were taken from refs.[7, 8]. In the rest of the paper we will discuss the direct CP asymmetry within SM framework and some possible extensions of the SM.

III. CP ASYMMETRY IN $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ WITHIN SM

Non-vanishing direct CP asymmetry requires a weak CP violating phase which is clearly absent at tree level in the process $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ as both a_1 and a_2 are real. As a consequence one has to calculate the corrections to a_1 and a_2 that can be generated at the loop level in order to generate the weak CP violating phase. It turns out that the corrections are very small as they are generated through box and di-penguin diagrams[12–14]. Detailed calculations of these corrections can be found in ref.[4]. The box contribution can lead to a correction to the Wilson coefficient c_2 that can be written as [4, 14, 15]

$$\Delta c_2 = \frac{G_F\, m_W^2}{\sqrt{2}\,\pi^2\, V_{cs}^* V_{ud}} b_x \tag{11}$$

where

$$b_x \simeq 3.6 \cdot 10^{-7} \mathrm{e}^{0.07 \cdot i} \tag{12}$$

The other corrections to the Wilson coefficients are due to the dipenguin diagrams and are given as [4, 12, 13, 16]

$$\Delta a_1 \simeq 2.8 \cdot 10^{-8} \mathrm{e}^{-0.004i}$$
$$\Delta a_2 \simeq -2.0 \cdot 10^{-9} \mathrm{e}^{0.07i} \tag{13}$$

Clearly from these correction the predicted direct CP asymmetry is still so tiny roughly speaking of order 10^{-8} or even can be smaller than that. This CP asymmetry is out of reach of current experiments at LHCb and also of near future experiments such as Super B factories at KEK. Thus this result motivates to extend the study to include New Physics extensions of the SM as we will consider in the next sections.

IV. NEW PHYSICS

Within New Physics possible complex couplings works as new sources for the CP violating weak phase. Since the short range physics in both $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ and $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ are the same we expect that the New Physics models that enhance the CP asymmetry in $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ will have the potential to enhance the CP asymmetry in $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$. In our earlier work on the CP asymmetry of $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ we have found that the possible candidates that enhanced the CP asymmetry are the models with charged Higgs bosons and the Left Right models [4]. In these classes of models the Wilson coefficients of the effective Hamiltonian governs the decay process of our interest can receive contribution from tree level diagrams and thus the complex phases in these Wilson coefficients will be dominant as the complex phase in the SM are generated at the loop level with large suppression as we showed in details in ref.[4].

In the next subsections, we study the direct CP asymmetry of $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ in the framework of these two candidates of New Physics beyond the SM. In addition we consider a toy model where we assume that only a_2 acquires an extra weak phase of 20°. We use this toy model just to illustrate that one can define several CP asymmetries and we show their behavior as a function of the kinematic variables of the process.

Model-fract.	χ_S	χ_P	ϕ_W	$f_i:$ S	P	SPI	I	II	III	IV	Tot.
Toy mod. f_i.	4.9	5.05	20	80.1	17	2.9	5.1	22.5	63.9	8.6	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.5	-3.3	-1.2	26.6	0.3
f_i	4.91	5.07	-20	80.2	16.4	3.4	5.1	24.2	65.6	5.1	
$A_{\rm CP}$		-	-	-	-		0.5	3.3	1.1	-26.4	-0.3

TABLE II. Partial fractions and $A_{\rm CP}$ in the toy model, adding a CPV phase to a_2. No pion-pion interaction was considered, BR=9.13(19) % [6], $\phi_{SP} = -65$.

A. CP asymmetry in $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ within a toy model

We consider a toy model where a_2 acquires an extra weak phase of 20°. Given that the two pions are identical one has to average with the term where the two pions are interchanged: $\pi_1 \leftrightarrow \pi_2$, and $s \to t = s_0$. In this case one can define several CPV asymmetries, like

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{\rm CP}(s=s_0,\ u) &= \frac{|A(s=s_0,u)|^2 - \left|\bar{A}(s=s_0,u)\right|^2}{2\,|A(s=s_0,u)|^2} + \frac{|A[t=s_0,u)]|^2 - \left|\bar{A}(t=s_0,u)\right|^2}{2\,|A(t=s_0,u)|^2} \\
&= \frac{|A(s=s_0,u)|^2 - \left|\bar{A}(s=s_0,u)\right|^2}{|A(s=s_0,u)|^2} \simeq \frac{2\sin\phi}{|A|^2}{\rm Im}\left(AA'^*\right) \\
A_{\rm CP}(s=s_0) &= \frac{\int {\rm d}u\left[|A(s=s_0,u)|^2 - \left|\bar{A}(s=s_0,u)\right|\right]^2}{2\int {\rm d}u\,|A(s=s_0,u)|^2} + \frac{\int {\rm d}u\left[|A[t=s_0,u)]|^2 - \left|\bar{A}(t=s_0,u)\right|^2\right]}{2\int {\rm d}u\,|A(t=s_0,u)|^2} \\
&= \frac{\int {\rm d}u\left[|A(s=s_0,u)|^2 - \left|\bar{A}(s=s_0,u)\right|^2\right]}{\int {\rm d}u\,|A(s=s_0,u)|^2} \simeq 2\sin\phi\frac{\int {\rm Im}\left(AA'^*\right)\ {\rm d}u}{\int |A|^2\ {\rm d}u} \\
A_{\rm CP,\ tot.} &= \frac{\int {\rm d}s{\rm d}u|\mathbf{p'_K}||\mathbf{p'_2}|\left[|A|^2 - \left|\bar{A}\right|^2\right]}{\int {\rm d}s{\rm d}u|\mathbf{p'_K}||\mathbf{p'_2}|\,|A|^2} \simeq 2\sin\phi\frac{\int {\rm Im}\left(AA'^*\right)\ {\rm d}s{\rm d}u}{\int |A|^2\ {\rm d}s{\rm d}u}
\end{aligned}
\tag{14}
$$

where A is the dominant SM amplitude, $A'_{\rm NP} = A'{\rm e}^{i\phi}$ is the New Physics amplitude with ϕ its CP-Violating(CPV) phase [17]. In Fig.(1) we show the plots of these asymmetries. In Table II we show the predicted partial fractions and the total $A_{\rm CP}$. It is interesting to emphasize the fact that even if the total CP asymmetry is small (around 0.003, it is possible to get much larger CP asymmetries restraining to one region of the phase space parameters. For instance in this toy model, in region IV, it is possible to get a CP asymmetry up to 25%.



FIG. 1. $A_{\rm CP}$ and its projections, for a toy model where a_2 acquires an extra weak phase of 20°.

B. A new charged gauge boson as Left Right models

In this section we consider a well known candidate for NP beyond the Standard Model based on extending the SM gauge group to include a new gauge group namely $SU(2)_R$[18–22]. Thus our gauge group defining the electroweak interaction is given by $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$. This extension of the SM has been widely studied in the literature (see for instance refs. [23–27]) and the constraints on the parameter space of the model have been derived using experimental measurements in refs. [28–33]. With the running of LHC, CMS [34, 35] and ATLAS [36, 37] collaborations have improved the bound on the scale of the W_R gauge boson mass [38].

There are two scenarios to be study in this context. The first one is to assume no mixing between W_L and W_R gauge bosons while the second one is to allow mixing between these gauge bosons.

We start our analysis with the first scenario. The new diagrams contributing to $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ are similar to the SM tree-level diagrams with W_L is replaced by a W_R. These diagrams lead to new contributions to the effective Hamiltonian governs our decay process that can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm LR}^{NM} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{g_R m_W}{g_L m_{W_R}} \right)^2 V_{Rcs}^* V_{Rud} \left(c_1' \bar{s} \gamma_\mu c_R \bar{u} \gamma^\mu d_R + c_2' \bar{u} \gamma_\mu c_R \bar{s} \gamma^\mu d_R \right) + \text{h.c.} \qquad (15)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{\rm LR}^{NM}$ denotes the effective Hamiltonian in the case of no mixing, g_R and g_L denote the gauge $SU(2)_R$ and $SU(2)_L$ couplings respectively. The gauge bosons associated with the gauge groups $SU(2)_L$ and $SU(2)_R$ have masses m_W and m_{W_R} respectively. The matrix V_R represents the quark mixing matrix that appears in the right sector of the Lagrangian similar to the CKM quark mixing matrix. The effective Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\rm LR}^{NM}$ lead to a contribution to the amplitude of the decay process under investigation. Although it is expected that the new contribution to amplitude will enhance the SM prediction for the CP asymmetry but still it will be suppressed due to the limit on M_{W_R} which has to be of order 2.3 TeV in this case of no-mixing Left right models [38].

We turn now to the second scenario where we assume mixing between W_L and W_R gauge bosons. This scenario can strongly enhance the CP violation in the Charm and muon sectors as has been concluded in refs.[39, 44]. Recently we have investigated this conclusion in the study of the CP asymmetry in the decay channel $D^0 \to K^- \pi^+$ where the enhanced asymmetry was at the level of 10% [4]. This motivates us to see what will be the maximum enhancement that can be reached for the CP asymmetry in $D^+ \to K^- \pi^+ \pi^+$ in this scenario.

We start our investigation by relating the weak eigenstate, W_L and W_R, to the mass eigenstates, W_1 and W_2 , of the $SU(2)_R$ and $SU(2)_L$ gauge bosons via [39]

$$\begin{pmatrix} W_L \\ W_R \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\xi & -\sin\xi \\ e^{i\omega}\sin\xi & e^{i\omega}\cos\xi \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{pmatrix} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\xi \\ e^{i\omega}\xi & e^{i\omega} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W_1 \\ W_2 \end{pmatrix} \qquad (16)$$

where ξ denotes the Left-Right (LR) mixing angle. Deviation to the non-unitarity of the CKM quark mixing matrix can lead to strong constraints on ξ and on the right scale M_R. In the case that the couplings g_R and g_L are equal at the unification scale i.e. the Left-Right symmetry is manifest, the mixing angle ξ has to be smaller than 0.005[40] and the right scale M_R has to be bigger than 2.5 TeV[38]. As a consequence, one expects that the predicted CP asymmetry will be so small also. On the other hand and in the case where g_R is different than g_L at the unification scale i.e. the Left-Right symmetry is not manifest, the limit on M_R scale is much less restrictive and the right gauge bosons could be as light as 0.3 TeV [41]. In this case, ξ can be as large as 0.02 if large CP violation phases in the right sector

Model-fract.	χ_S	χ_P	ϕ_{LR} [°]	$f_i:$ S	P	SPI	I	II	III	IV	Tot.
LR mod. f_i.	5	5.655	30	80.2	15.4	4.3	4.8	23.7	65.4	6.1	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	- -	-	-	-	-	-0.4	1.2	1.9	-2.2	1.3
LR mod. f_i.	4.956	5.64	60	80.2	15.9	3.9	4.7	23.7	65.4	6.1	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.6	2.1	3.2	-3.7	2.3
LR mod. f_i.	4.923	5.625	90	80.2	16.5	3.3	4.8	23.7	65.3	6.2	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.7	2.4	3.7	-4.1	2.7
LR mod. f_i.	4.907	5.605	120	80.2	17	2.8	4.9	23.6	65	6.5	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.6	2.1	3.2	-3.5	2.3
LR mod. f_i.	4.913	5.59	150	80.2	17.4	2.4	5	23.6	64.7	6.7	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.3	1.2	1.8	-2	1.3
LR mod. f_i.	4.974	5.59	-150	80.2	17.4	2.5	5.2	23.5	64.2	7.1	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-1.2	-1.8	2	1.3
LR mod. f_i.	5.015	5.6	-120	80.2	16.9	2.9	5.2	23.5	64.2	7.1	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	-2	-3.1	3.5	-2.2
LR mod. f_i.	5.05	5.62	-90	80.2	16.4	3.4	5.2	23.5	64.3	7	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.6	-2.4	-3.6	4.1	-2.6
LR mod. f_i.	5.067	5.64	-60	80.2	15.8	4	5.1	23.6	64.6	6.8	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	-2.1	-3.2	3.7	-2.3
LR mod. f_i.	5.063	5.655	-30	80.2	15.4	4.4	5	23.6	64.9	6.5	
$A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-1.2	-1.8	2.2	-1.3

TABLE III. Partial fractions and $A_{\rm CP}$ with $|c_{LR}| = 0.02$ which corresponds to its maximum value allowed from the Twist coll.[45, 46], for different values of its phase. No pion-pion interaction was considered, BR=9.13(19) % [6], $\phi_{SP} = -65$.

are present [25] still compatible with experimental data [42–44]. It has shown recently that, taking $g_L = g_R$, the precision measurement of the muon decay parameters done by TWIST collaboration [45, 46] can set model independent limit on ξ to be smaller than 0.03. We adopt this case in our analysis and take $\xi \sim 10^{-2}$.

The charged currents interaction can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} \simeq -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{U}\gamma_\mu\left(g_L V P_L + g_R \xi \bar{V}^R P_R\right) D W_1^\dagger - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{U}\gamma_\mu\left(-g_L \xi V P_L + g_R \bar{V}^R P_R\right) D W_2^\dagger \quad (17)$$

where $V = V_{\rm CKM}$ and $\bar{V}^R = \mathrm{e}^{i\omega} V^R$. Integrating out the W_1 in the usual way and neglecting the W_2 contributions, given its mass is much higher, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff.} = \frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\Bigg[& c_1 \bar{s}\gamma_\mu \left(V^* P_L + \frac{g_R}{g_L}\xi \bar{V}^{R*} P_R\right)_{cs} c\bar{u}\gamma^\mu \left(V P_L + \frac{g_R}{g_L}\xi \bar{V}^R P_R\right)_{ud} d \\ & + c_2 \bar{s}_\alpha \gamma_\mu \left(V^* P_L + \frac{g_R}{g_L}\xi \bar{V}^{R*} P_R\right)_{cs} c_\beta \bar{u}_\beta \gamma^\mu \left(V P_L + \frac{g_R}{g_L}\xi \bar{V}^R P_R\right)_{ud} d_\alpha \Bigg] + \text{h. c.} \quad (18)\end{aligned}$$

The terms proportional to ξ of the effective Hamiltonian lead to

$$\Delta\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff.} \simeq \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{g_R}{g_L}\xi\left[V_{cs}^* \bar{V}_{ud}^R \left(c_1 \bar{s}\gamma_\mu c_L \bar{u}\gamma^\mu d_R - 2c_2 \bar{u} c_L \bar{s} d_R\right) + \bar{V}_{cs}^{R*} V_{ud}\left(c_1 \bar{s}\gamma_\mu c_R \bar{u}\gamma^\mu d_L - 2c_2 \bar{u} c_R \bar{s} d_L\right)\right] + \text{h.c.} \quad (19)$$

It is direct, see Appendix VI for matrix elements of the operators, to show that $\Delta\mathcal{H}_{\rm eff.}$ result in a new contribution to the amplitude of $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ given by

$$\delta A_{D^+\to K^-\pi^+\pi^+} = -\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}\frac{g_R}{g_L}\xi\left(V_{cs}^* \bar{V}_{ud}^R + \bar{V}_{cs}^{R*} V_{ud}\right)\left(a_1 A_1 + 2a_2 M^2_{D\to K\pi\pi} F_0^{K^-\pi^+}(s) F_0^{D^+\pi^+}(s)\right) \quad (20)$$

and thus the total amplitude becomes

$$A_{D^+\to K^-\pi^+\pi^+} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{ud}\left[a_1(1-c_{LR})A_1 + a_2[A_2 - 2c_{LR} M^2_{D\to K\pi\pi} F_0^{K^-\pi^+}(s) F_0^{D^+\pi^+}(s)]\right] \quad (21)$$

with $c_{LR} = (g_R\xi/g_L)\left(\bar{V}_{ud}^R/V_{ud} + \bar{V}_{cs}^{R*}/V_{cs}^*\right)$. We start our numerical analysis for the CP asymmetry by parameterizing c_{LR} as $c_{LR} = |c_{LR}|\mathrm{e}^{i\phi_{LR}}$. In Table III we show the corresponding predictions for the partial fractions and CP asymmetry as a function of the phase ϕ_{LR} for $|c_{LR}| = 0.02$, the maximum value allowed from the Twist coll.[45, 46], for different values of the phase ϕ_{LR}. We see from the table that the partial fractions and the predicted CP asymmetry varies with the phase ϕ_{LR} as expected but can be as large as 25% in some cinematical region of phase space. Thus measuring a large CP asymmetry in this decay channel would be a hint of LR symmetric model with mixing between W_L and W_R gauge bosons.

V. MODELS WITH CHARGED HIGGS CONTRIBUTIONS

Charged Higgs appears in extensions of the Higgs sector of the SM as one of the physical mass eigenstates. In one of these extensions a new $SU(2)_L$ doublet is added to the Higgs sector of the SM. With this new doublet, there are several possibilities to couple the two Higgs doublets to the fermions. As a consequence we have different types of these two Higgs doublet models (2HDM) such as type I, II or III and so on (for a review see ref. [47]). LEP has performed a Direct search for a charged Higgs in 2HDM type II. They obtained a bound on the charged Higgs mass of 78.6 GeV [48]. Recently the results on $B \to \tau\nu$ obtained by BABAR [49] and BELLE [50] have improved the indirect constraints on the charged Higgs mass in type II 2HDM [51]:

$$m_{H^+} > 240GeV \quad at \quad 95\%CL \tag{22}$$

In our study we will adopt 2HDM type III which is a general model where both two Higgs doublets can couple to up and down quarks. This means that 2HDM type III can lead to Flavor changing neutral currents and thus they can be used to strongly constrain the new parameters in the model. With the presence of the complex couplings in the model that escape the strong constraints one expects to have a sizable contribution to the direct CP asymmetry as we have shown in our earlier work on the CP asymmetry of $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$[4].

The Yukawa Lagrangian of the 2HDM of type III is given as [52, 53]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_Y^{eff} &= \bar{Q}^a_{f\,L}\left[Y^d_{fi}\epsilon_{ab}H_d^{b\star} - \epsilon^d_{fi}H_u^a\right] d_{i\,R} \\ &\quad - \bar{Q}^a_{f\,L}\left[Y^u_{fi}\epsilon_{ab}H_u^{b\star} + \epsilon^u_{fi}H_d^a\right] u_{i\,R} + \text{H.c.}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

here ϵ_{ab} is the totally antisymmetric tensor, and ϵ^q_{ij} stands for the non-holomorphic corrections that couple up (down) quarks to the down (up) type Higgs doublet. After electroweak symmetry breaking, the effective Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_Y^{eff}$ gives rise to the Higgs couplings to quarks given as:

$$i\left(\Gamma^{H^\pm\,LR\,\text{eff}}_{u_f d_i}P_R + \Gamma^{H^\pm\,RL\,\text{eff}}_{u_f d_i}P_L\right)\,, \tag{24}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{H^\pm\,LR\,\text{eff}}_{u_f d_i} &= \sum_{j=1}^{3}\sin\beta\, V_{fj}\left(\frac{m_{d_i}}{v_d}\delta_{ji} - \epsilon^d_{ji}\tan\beta\right), \\ \Gamma^{H^\pm\,RL\,\text{eff}}_{u_f d_i} &= \sum_{j=1}^{3}\cos\beta\,\left(\frac{m_{u_f}}{v_u}\delta_{jf} - \epsilon^{u\star}_{jf}\tan\beta\right)V_{ji}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where v_d and v_u are the vacuum expectations values of the neutral component of the Higgs doublets and V denotes the CKM matrix. The Feynman-rule given in Eq. (24) can lead to the effective Hamiltonian that governs the process under consideration after integrating out the charged Higgs mediating the tree diagram

$$\mathcal{H}_{eff}^{H\pm} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cs}^* V_{ud} \sum_{i=1}^{4} C_i^H(\mu) Q_i^H(\mu), \tag{26}$$

here C_i^H denotes the Wilson coefficients obtained by perturbative QCD running from $M_{H^\pm}$ scale to the scale μ relevant for hadronic decay and Q_i^H are the corresponding local operators at low energy scale $\mu \simeq m_c$. These operators can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1^H &= (\bar{s}P_R c)(\bar{u}P_L d), \\ Q_2^H &= (\bar{s}P_L c)(\bar{u}P_R d), \\ Q_3^H &= (\bar{s}P_L c)(\bar{u}P_L d), \\ Q_4^H &= (\bar{s}P_R c)(\bar{u}P_R d), \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

and their corresponding Wilson coefficients C_i^H, at the electroweak scale, are given by

$$\begin{aligned} C_1^H &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{G_F V_{cs}^* V_{ud} m_H^2} \Bigg(\sum_{j=1}^{3} \cos\beta\, V_{j1} \left(\frac{m_u}{v_u}\delta_{j1} - \epsilon_{j1}^{u\star} \tan\beta \right) \Bigg) \Bigg(\sum_{k=1}^{3} \cos\beta\, V_{k2}^\star \left(\frac{m_c}{v_u}\delta_{k2} - \epsilon_{k2}^{u} \tan\beta \right) \Bigg), \\ C_2^H &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{G_F V_{cs}^* V_{ud} m_H^2} \Bigg(\sum_{j=1}^{3} \sin\beta\, V_{1j} \left(\frac{m_d}{v_d}\delta_{j1} - \epsilon_{j1}^{d} \tan\beta \right) \Bigg) \Bigg(\sum_{k=1}^{3} \sin\beta\, V_{2k}^\star \left(\frac{m_s}{v_d}\delta_{k2} - \epsilon_{k2}^{d\star} \tan\beta \right) \Bigg) \\ C_3^H &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{G_F V_{cs}^* V_{ud} m_H^2} \Bigg(\sum_{j=1}^{3} \cos\beta\, V_{j1} \left(\frac{m_u}{v_u}\delta_{j1} - \epsilon_{j1}^{u\star} \tan\beta \right) \Bigg) \Bigg(\sum_{k=1}^{3} \sin\beta\, V_{2k}^\star \left(\frac{m_s}{v_d}\delta_{k2} - \epsilon_{k2}^{d\star} \tan\beta \right) \Bigg), \\ C_4^H &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{G_F V_{cs}^* V_{ud} m_H^2} \Bigg(\sum_{k=1}^{3} \cos\beta\, V_{k2}^\star \left(\frac{m_c}{v_u}\delta_{k2} - \epsilon_{k2}^{u} \tan\beta \right) \Bigg) \Bigg(\sum_{j=1}^{3} \sin\beta\, V_{1j} \left(\frac{m_d}{v_d}\delta_{j1} - \epsilon_{j1}^{d} \tan\beta \right) \Bigg) \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

The contribution of the charged Higgs to the amplitude of the decay process under consideration can be obtained via

$$< K^- \pi^+ \pi^+ | \mathcal{H}_{eff}^{H\pm} | D^+ > \equiv \delta A_{D^+ \to K^- \pi^+ \pi^+}^{H^\pm} \tag{29}$$

To calculate the matrix element in the last equation we first use Fierz's identities to rewrite the set of the operators in Eq.(27) in a new basis include only vector, axial vectors and tensor operators. Second we can easily write the vector and axial vector operators in

terms of A_1 and A_2 and for the matrix element of the tensor operator we can parametrize it as we will show below. Thus we find

$$\begin{aligned}
< K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}\,P_L\,c\,\bar{u}\,P_R\,d|D^+ > &= < K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}\;P_R\,c\,\bar{u}\,P_L\,d|D^+ > \\
&= \frac{m_\pi^2}{(m_c+m_s)(m_u+m_d)}A_1 - \frac{1}{2N}A_2 \\
< K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}\,P_L\,c\,\bar{u}\,P_L\,d|D^+ > &= < K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}\,P_R\,c\,\bar{u}\,P_R\,d|D^+ >= -\frac{m_\pi^2}{(m_c+m_s)(m_u+m_d)}A_1 \\
&+ \frac{1}{2N}\frac{\Delta_{D\pi}^2\Delta_{K\pi}^2}{(m_c-m_u)(m_s-m_d)}F_0^{K^-\pi^+}(s)F_0^{D^+\pi^+}(s) + T
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

here T represents the contribution of the tensor operators. The explicit form of T can be obtained upon calculating the matrix elements of the tensor operators that can written as

$$\begin{aligned}
< K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,P_L\,d\,\bar{u}\,\sigma_{\mu\nu}\,P_L\,c|D^+ > &= < K^-\pi_1^+|\bar{s}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,P_L\,d|0 >< \pi_2^+|\bar{u}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\,P_L\,c|D^+ > \\
< K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,P_R\,d\,\bar{u}\,\sigma_{\mu\nu}\,P_Rc|D^+ > &= < K^-\pi_1^+|\bar{s}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,P_R\,d|0 >< \pi_2^+|\bar{u}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\,P_Rc|D^+ >
\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Using the kinematic of the decay process it is direct to parameterize the matrix elements in the last equation as (see Appendix VI for details)

$$\begin{aligned}
< K^-\pi_1^+\pi_2^+|\bar{s}\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,P_L\,d\,\bar{u}\sigma_{\mu\nu}\,P_L\,c|D^+ > &= < K^-\pi_1^+\pi_2^+|\bar{s}\,\sigma^{\mu\nu}\,P_R\,d\,\bar{u}\,\sigma_{\mu\nu}\,P_R\,c|D^+ > \\
&= 4\,h^{K^-\pi^+}(s)\,h^{D^+\pi^+}(s)\left[s(t-u)-\Delta_{D\pi}^2\Delta_{K\pi}^2\right]
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Thus finally we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta A^{H^\pm}_{D^+\to K^-\pi^+\pi^+} &= (C_1^H + C_2^H - C_3^H - C_4^H)\chi^{\pi^+}A_1 - \frac{1}{2N}(C_1^H + C_2^H)A_2 \\
&+ \frac{1}{2N}(C_3^H + C_4^H)\frac{\Delta_{D\pi}^2\Delta_{K\pi}^2}{(m_c-m_u)(m_s-m_d)}F_0^{K^-\pi^+}(s)F_0^{D^+\pi^+}(s) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2N}(C_3^H + C_4^H)\left[s(t-u)-\Delta_{D\pi}^2\Delta_{K\pi}^2\right]h^{D^+\pi^+}(s)\,h^{K^-\pi^+}(s)
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where

$$\chi^{\pi^+} = \frac{m_\pi^2}{(m_c+m_s)(m_u+m_d)} \tag{34}$$

and we can write the total amplitude as

$$A_{D^+\to K^-\pi^+\pi^+} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}}V_{cs}V_{ud}\,(a_1A_1 + a_2A_2) + \delta A^{H^\pm}_{D^+\to K^-\pi^+\pi^+} \tag{35}$$

We now discuss the experimental constraints on the parameters ϵ_{ij}^q where $q = d, u$ that appear in the Wilson coefficients. In the down sector, ϵ_{ij}^d, we find that for $i \neq j$ the

Model-fract.	χ_S	χ_P	ϕ_W	$f_i:$ S	P	SPI	I	II	III	IV	
Higgs-frac	4.96	5.565	30	80.2	16.4	3.3	5	23.4	65	6.5	
Higgs-$10^4 \times A_{\rm CP}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4	-1.6	-8.2	-19	-6.9
Higgs-$10^4 \times A_{\rm CP}$	4.975	5.58	60	-	-	-	2.5	-2.8	-14	-33	-12
Higgs-$10^4 \times A_{\rm CP}$	4.994	5.6	90	-	-	-	2.9	-3.2	-17	-39	-14
Higgs-$10^4 \times A_{\rm CP}$	5.01	5.625	120	-	-	-	2.6	-2.8	-14	-34	-12
Higgs-$10^4 \times A_{\rm CP}$	5.025	5.64	150	-	-	-	1.5	-1.6	-8.3	-20	-7

TABLE IV. Partial fractions and $A_{\rm CP}$. In the Higgs case with $|\epsilon^u_{22}| = 0.7$, $\tan\beta = 100$ and $m_H = 240$ GeV. The BR=9.13(19) % [6], $\phi_{SP} = -65$. The partial fractions are almost constant to the value in the first row.

parameters ϵ^d_{ij} are strongly constrained from FCNC processes in the down sector because of tree-level neutral Higgs exchange. Hence, we are left only with ϵ^d_{11} and ϵ^d_{22}. On the other hand in the up sector, ϵ^u_{ij}, we note that only the terms proportional to ϵ^u_{11} and ϵ^u_{22} can significantly affect the Wilson coefficients without any CKM suppression factors. Other ϵ^u_{ij} terms will be suppressed by orders λ or λ^2 or higher and so we can safely neglect them in the analysis.

The naturalness criterion of 't Hooft set sever constraints on the ϵ^d_{11}, ϵ^d_{22} and ϵ^u_{11} due to the smallness of the down, strange and up quark masses respectively while ϵ^u_{22} become less constrained as discussed in Refs.[4, 54]. Thus we keep in our analysis terms that proportional to ϵ^u_{22} and drop the terms that are proportional to ϵ^d_{11}, ϵ^d_{22} and ϵ^u_{11}. The relevant constraints on ϵ^u_{22} have been discussed in details in Refs.[4, 54] and thus we take into account these constraints in the analysis of the CP asymmetry below.

We start our analysis for Higgs contribution to the CP asymmetry by parameterizing ϵ^u_{22} as $\epsilon^u_{22} = |\epsilon^u_{22}|{\rm e}^{i\phi_W}$. From the constraints discussed above, as an example, we can take $|\epsilon^u_{22}| = 0.7$ for $m_H = 240\,GeV$ and $\tan\beta = 100$. In Table IV we show the corresponding predictions for the partial fractions and CP asymmetry as a function of the phase ϕ_W. We see from the table that the partial fractions are almost constant to the value in the first row. On the other hand, from Table IV, we note that the predicted CP asymmetry varies with the phase ϕ_W and can reach a maximum value of $A_{CP} \simeq -1.4 \times 10^{-3}$. For larger values of m_H and smaller values of $\tan\beta$ we find that the predicted asymmetry $A_{CP} \leq \mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have studied the Cabibbo favored non-leptonic $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ decay. We have shown that the direct CP asymmetry in this decay mode within SM is strongly suppressed and out of experimental range. Then we have explored new physics models namely, a toy model with CP violating weak phase equals 20° in a_2, a model with extra gauge bosons within Left-Right Grand Unification models and a model with charged Higgs Field.

The toy model strongly improved SM prediction of the CP asymmetry where the predicted CP asymmetry can reach 30%. This asymmetry is large and if confirmed it will be an indication of NP beyond SM and it will be challenging to find a New Physics extension of the SM that can produce this weak phase in a_2 only.

The next model which is most promising is non-manifest Left-Right extension of the SM where the left right mixing between the gauge bosons leads to a strong enhancement in the CP asymmetry. In this class of models, it is possible to get large CP asymmetry 25% which can be tested in the LHCb and the next generation of charm or B factories.

Our last model, the 2HDM type III, can lead to a CP asymmetry that depends on the charged Higgs masses and couplings. A maximal value approximately a maximum value of $A_{CP} \simeq -1.4 \times 10^{-3}$ can be reached with a Higgs mass of 240 GeV and large tanβ. Larger values of charged Higgs mass lead to a smaller direct CP asymmetries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

D. D. is grateful to Conacyt (México) S.N.I. and Conacyt project (CB-156618), DAIP project (Guanajuato University) and PIFI (Secretaria de Educacion Publica, México) for financial support. G. Faisel work is supported by research grants NTU-ERP-102R7701 (National Taiwan University).

APPENDIX

For $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ the expectation values of the corresponding Left Right operators are

$$
\begin{aligned}
< K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}\gamma_\mu c_L \bar{u}\gamma^\mu d_R|D^+ > &= < K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}\gamma_\mu c_R \bar{u}\gamma^\mu d_L|D^+ > \\
&= -A_1 - \frac{2}{N} M^2_{D\to K\pi\pi} F_0^{K^-\pi^+}(s) F_0^{D^+\pi^+}(s) \\
< K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}d_R \bar{u}c_L|D^+ > &= < K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}d_L \bar{u}c_R|D^+ > \\
&= \frac{1}{2N} A_1 + M^2_{D\to K\pi\pi} F_0^{K^-\pi^+}(s) F_0^{D^+\pi^+}(s) \qquad (36)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the expression for A_1 can be found in ref.[7] and

$$
M^2_{D\to K\pi\pi} = \frac{\Delta^2_{D\pi}\Delta^2_{K\pi}}{(m_c - m_u)(m_s - m_d)} \qquad (37)
$$

In the case of the charged Higgs one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
&< K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}c_L \bar{u}d_R|D^+ > = < K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}c_R \bar{u}d_L|D^+ > = \frac{m_\pi^2}{(m_c + m_s)(m_u + m_d)} A_1 - \frac{1}{2N} A_2 \\
&< K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}c_L \bar{u}d_L|D^+ > = < K^-\pi^+\pi^+|\bar{s}c_R \bar{u}d_R|D^+ > \\
&= -\frac{m_\pi^2}{(m_c + m_s)(m_u + m_d)} A_1 + \frac{1}{2N} \frac{\Delta^2_{D\pi}\Delta^2_{K\pi}}{(m_c - m_u)(m_s - m_d)} F_0^{K^-\pi^+}(s) F_0^{D^+\pi^+}(s) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2N} \left[s(t-u) - \Delta^2_{D\pi}\Delta^2_{K\pi} \right] h^{K^-\pi^+}(s) h^{D^+\pi^+}(s) \qquad (38)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the h form factors from the tensor part and the expression for A_1 and A_2 can be found in ref.[7].

---

[1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963).

[2] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).

[3] CKM Fitter: USA, Europe : www.slac.stanford.edu/xorg/ckmfitter, ckmfitter.in2p3.fr/
A. Garmash, et al. [Belle coll.], Phys. Rev. **D75**, 012006 (2007) [hep-ex/0610081].

[4] D. Delepine, G. Faisel and C. A. Ramirez, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 7, 075017 (2013) [arXiv:1212.6281 [hep-ph]].

[5] M. Artuso, B. Meadows and A. A. Petrov, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **58**, 249 (2008) [arXiv:0802.2934 [hep-ph]].
F. Buccella, M. Lusignoli, G. Miele, A. Pugliese and P. Santorelli, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 3478 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9411286].

[6] K.A. Olive et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C, 38, 090001 (2014).
Heavy Flavor Averaging Group (HFAG), Y. Amhis *et al.* [Heavy Flavor Averaging Group Collaboration], *Averages of b-hadron, c-hadron, and tau-lepton properties as of early 2012*, arXiv:1207.1158 [hep-ex].
J. N. Butler *et al.* [Quark Flavor Physics Working Group Collaboration], *Report of the Quark Flavor Physics Working Group*, arXiv:1311.1076 [hep-ex].

[7] D. R. Boito and R. Escribano, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 054007 (2009) [arXiv:0907.0189 [hep-ph]].

[8] B. El-Bennich, A. Furman, R. Kaminski, L. Lesniak, B. Loiseau and B. Moussallam, *CP violation and kaon-pion interactions in $B \to K\pi^+\pi^-$ decays*, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 094005 (2009) [Erratum-ibid. D **83**, 039903 (2011)] [arXiv:0902.3645 [hep-ph]].

[9] H. Y. Cheng, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 034024 (2003) [hep-ph/0212117].

[10] D. Melikhov and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 014006 (2000) [hep-ph/0001113].

[11] S. Fajfer and J. F. Kamenik, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 034029 (2005) [hep-ph/0506051].

[12] J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich and G. Valencia, Phys. Rev. D **33**, 1387 (1986).

[13] A. A. Petrov, In *Upton 1997, Hadron spectroscopy* 852-855 [hep-ph/9712279].

[14] G. Branco, L. Lavoura and J. Silva, *CP violation*, Clarendon (1999).

[15] X. -G. He, J. Tandean and G. Valencia, Eur. Phys. J. C **64**, 681 (2009) [arXiv:0909.3638 [hep-ph]].

[16] S. -P. Chia, Phys. Lett. B **130**, 315 (1983).

[17] R. M. White [BaBar Collaboration], arXiv:1308.0080 [hep-ex].

[18] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, Phys. Rev. Lett. **31**, 661 (1973).

[19] R. N. Mohapatra and J. C. Pati, Phys. Rev. D **11**, 566 (1975).

[20] R. N. Mohapatra and J. C. Pati, Phys. Rev. D **11**, 2558 (1975).

[21] G. Senjanovic and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. D **12**, 1502 (1975).

[22] G. Senjanovic, Nucl. Phys. B **153**, 334 (1979).

[23] G. Beall, M. Bander and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 848 (1982).

[24] D. Cocolicchio, G. Costa, G. L. Fogli, J. H. Kim and A. Masiero, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 1477 (1989).

[25] P. Langacker and S. U. Sankar, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 1569 (1989).

[26] P. L. Cho and M. Misiak, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 5894 (1994) [hep-ph/9310332].

[27] K. S. Babu, K. Fujikawa and A. Yamada, Phys. Lett. B **333**, 196 (1994) [hep-ph/9312315].

[28] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).

[29] J. P. Alexander *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **56**, 5320 (1997) [hep-ex/9705009].

[30] D. Acosta *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 081802 (2003) [hep-ex/0209030].

[31] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **641**, 423 (2006) [hep-ex/0607102].

[32] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 211803 (2008) [arXiv:0803.3256 [hep-ex]].

[33] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **699**, 145 (2011) [arXiv:1101.0806 [hep-ex]].

[34] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], JHEP **1208**, 023 (2012) [arXiv:1204.4764 [hep-ex]].

[35] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], arXiv:1208.0956 [hep-ex].

[36] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **705**, 28 (2011) [arXiv:1108.1316 [hep-ex]].

[37] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 081801 (2012) [arXiv:1205.1016 [hep-ex]].

[38] A. Maiezza, M. Nemevsek, F. Nesti and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 055022 (2010) [arXiv:1005.5160 [hep-ph]].

[39] C. -H. Chen, C. -Q. Geng and W. Wang, arXiv:1206.5158 [hep-ph].

[40] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. D **29**, 2130 (1984).

[41] F. I. Olness and M. E. Ebel, Phys. Rev. D **30**, 1034 (1984).

[42] J. -h. Jang, K. Y. Lee, S. C. Park and H. S. Song, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 055006 (2002) [hep-ph/0010107].

[43] A. Badin, F. Gabbiani and A. A. Petrov, Phys. Lett. B **653**, 230 (2007) [arXiv:0707.0294 [hep-ph]].

[44] K. Y. Lee and S. -h. Nam, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 035001 (2012) [arXiv:1111.4666 [hep-ph]].

[45] R. P. MacDonald *et al.* [TWIST Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **78**, 032010 (2008) [arXiv:0807.1125 [hep-ex]].

[46] A. Hillairet *et al.* [TWIST Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **85**, 092013 (2012) [arXiv:1112.3606 [hep-ex]].

[47] G. C. Branco, P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. N. Rebelo, M. Sher and J. P. Silva, Phys. Rept. **516**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1106.0034 [hep-ph]].

[48] [LEP Higgs Working Group for Higgs boson searches and ALEPH and DELPHI and L3 and

OPAL Collaborations], hep-ex/0107031.

[49] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **81**, 051101 (2010) [arXiv:0912.2453 [hep-ex]].

[50] K. Hara *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **82**, 071101 (2010) [arXiv:1006.4201 [hep-ex]].

[51] M. Baak, M. Goebel, J. Haller, A. Hoecker, D. Ludwig, K. Moenig, M. Schott and J. Stelzer, Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 2003 (2012) [arXiv:1107.0975 [hep-ph]].

[52] A. Crivellin, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 056001 (2011) [arXiv:1012.4840 [hep-ph]].

[53] A. Crivellin, C. Greub and A. Kokulu, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 054014 (2012) [arXiv:1206.2634 [hep-ph]].

[54] A. Crivellin, A. Kokulu and C. Greub, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 9, 094031 (2013) [arXiv:1303.5877 [hep-ph]].